

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed May 24, 2005, considered Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, 17, 20-23 and 25-39 and 41-43. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, 17, 20-23, 25-31, 34-37, 39 and 41 (including all of the independent Claims 1, 15, 31 and 39) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dan Johnson (Circuit Cellar Ink, February 1998). Several dependent Claims 32, 33, 38, 42, 43 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dan Johnson (Circuit Cellar Ink, February 1998) in view of Official Notice.¹ By this amendment, Claim 41 is cancelled and Claim 44 is new. Accordingly, upon entry of this amendment, Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, 17, 20-23, 25-39 and 42-44 will be pending for further consideration. The new Claim 44 is supported, for example, at page 22, first paragraph, of the applicants' specification.

As an initial matter, the undersigned attorney of record challenges the Official Notice taken in Section 6 of the Final Office Action. Specifically, the Office Action states the following:

An Official Notice is taken for the computer-readable instructions and computer readable medium having data structure (physical storage) which by virtue causes the implementation of a method such as of claims 31 and 39 and it itself is non-displayable data and not accessible to the network device. This provides security against changes / alterations by the personnel which are not authorized to access or change.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

The undersigned respectfully challenges the factual assertion that the computer-readable instructions and computer readable medium having data structure "by virtue causes the implementation of a method such as of claims 31 and 39 and it itself is non-displayable data and not accessible to the network device." The undersigned also respectfully submits that the Official Notice is not clear in terms of what is being factually asserted, nor how the factual assertion would affect the patentability of the claims being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) using the Official Notice.

All of the pending claims are rejected over Johnson either singly or in combination with the Official Notice. However, each of the independent claims (as currently amended herein) recites *inter alia*, template constants that are generic across multiple languages (e.g., English, French, or Russian). This language is supported in the specification, for example, at page 22, first full paragraph.

Johnson simply does not describe the use of such template constants that are generic across multiple languages. The Office Action contends that page 41, right column, fifth paragraph teaches this feature. However, that paragraph never mentions any such feature. The Official Notice also does not contend that this feature is part of the prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is appropriate and respectfully requested.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 12th day of July, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorneys for Applicants
Customer No. 047973

AJL:ds
AB0000000308V001